Chapter 4

Aneta Gołębiowska-Tobiasz

Typological Systems

The variety of Turkic anthropomorphic statues, created in various periods of time and on broad areas required classification systems allowing for the study of their history, analysis of the evolution of the canon and their development. Statues have divided stelae by depicted gender (androgynous, feminine, masculine), posture (standing, sitting), manner of presenting figures (schematic, realistic), raw materials used for production, method of shaping the stone (shallow or deep relief), details of attire, hairstyle, outfit of figures (whole figure dressed or only its selected parts) and attribution of selected items (utensils, weapons).

The first typological division of stelae was developed by P. A. Uvarov in 1871. He distinguished three types of statues: 1. stela-shaped, 2. standing, 3. sitting and half-sitting. Then he divided them into masculine and feminine subtypes. He dated younger stelae to the 4th – 5th centuries A.D. Based on this classification, subsequent researchers developed their own typologies series. However, these fundamental division continue in use to this day.

In 1966 G. A. Fedorov-Davidov, analysing 280 preserved exemplars of statues, created more extensive divisions. He based his classification on the posture of stelae (type) and the sex of the person depicted on a statue (subtype). He did not take into account the method of working the stone. When the sex or the posture was unclear, he rejected the exemplar from the analysis. Fedorov-Davidov's fundamental typology of was the following: standing stelae with a vessel in hands belongs to type I; sitting stelae with a vessel in hands belongs to type II; stela- or column-shaped statues, without depicted limbs or vessels, he included into type III. Each of the types he divided into masculine and feminine subtypes (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 168). Next, he analysed categories of objects represented on the statues. On the feminine stelae he distinguished categories of: hats and their details, bands, pendants on temples, "horns" (horned ornaments of faces), cape-scarfs, earrings, bars (hryvnia), necklaces, collars of shirts, whips, mirrors. In the typological division of masculine stelae he took into account the following details: helmets, back protective plates and systems of straps, breastplates and straps, bows, quivers, swords and flints. Some further items he analysed on both feminine and masculine stelae, namely the following: coiffure, sleeves, bottom edge of attire on the front side of stelae, bottom edge of attire on the back side of stelae, belts, shoes, straps and buckles of garters, vessels, combs, knives, collars of caftans, edge of caftans on an upper part of torso, purses, scissors, unspecified objects, anthropo- and zoomorphic objects

and decorative motifs. The author placed in this part of the typology objects occurring only on feminine stelae, such as scissors, as well as objects typical for masculine stelae, such as details of coiffure (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 168-179). On feminine anthropomorphic stelae there is no hair on the relief. Hair is hidden under a cap and a scarf. However, it is possible that braids were painted on. The next stage of research was to analyse occurrences of certain categories of items in relation to types and subtypes of stelae. The result of the analysis was the observation that differences of details are associated with chronological diversity. The author believed that standing type stelae are older, due to the similarity of the posture to Asian stelae occurring in the area of Semirechye and Kazakhstan. He did not explain where the "sitting" style came from. Standing stelae were also ancestors of sitting stelae and stela-shaped statues (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 184-185). It should be noted that Fedorov-Davidov did not analyse the technical condition of statues.

S. A. Pletneva developed her own classification system, based on collected material, by selecting as a starting point the sexdepicted (feminine and masculine groups). The second aspect analysed was the canon of presentations. She classified standing, sitting and unspecified stela-shaped statues. She then transferred the data collected into pole diagrams plotted on a map, and thereby obtained the distribution of certain types of stelae in relation to territories occupied by particular Polovtsian groups. As a result, she noticed that the number of feminine stelae in relation to masculine presentations is slightly different in the entire Polovtsian territory (Pletneva, 1974a, 60). The third substantial value of this classification was the indication of a type of the presentation of a figure (three subtypes), however here the researcher was inconsistent. For masculine stelae each of outlines corresponded to an applicable subtype (outline I corresponded to the subtype a, II – b, III – w). For feminine stelae, outline I corresponded to subtype a, outlines II and III – subtype b (Pletneva, 1974a, 61, 65).

The next feature systematised by Pletneva was the type and depth of reliefs (four types for masculine and feminine stelae). Then, she generally divided the material into six types for certain sections. Type I she classified as feminine and masculine stela-shaped statues with depicted details of a head, hands and a vessel. Most often they were forged from granite. Type II are feminine and masculine stelae presented as standing with the upper part of a body and its details depicted, and the stela-shaped lower part with sculptured legs. Type III contains spatial figures of standing warriors, and was divided into three subtypes depending on the outline of a figure. For feminine stelae the type was divided into two subtypes. These stelae are characterised by slender silhouettes and preserved proportions of a body. It was common to sculpture an openwork space between the hands and body, which enhanced the impression of slenderness. Type IV presented sitting men. The upper part of stelae was characterised by a spatial silhouette, the lower part had legs sculptured in the flat relief technique.

Pletneva, however, found only one feminine stela that could be classified within this type (Pletneva, 1974a, 65). The type V contains spatial figures of sitting men and women, divided into three subtypes in accordance with an outline of masculine silhouettes and two subtypes for feminine silhouettes. Figures of women dressed in galligaskins, sometimes with weapons at their waist, were characteristic for the subtype of feminine stelae. The b subtype represented semi-sitting figures, often with legs covered by the tails of a caftan. Type VI depicted stela-shaped flat feminine and masculine silhouettes from the waist upwards. Type VII included pole-shaped spatial feminine and masculine figures with precisely presented details of heads and bodies, but without limbs. Feminine statues of this type contain more details and, in addition to a carefully sculptured head, sometimes have also a sculptured vessel at waist height.

Pletneva then compared presented details, techniques and raw materials. As a result she obtained a probable picture of the evolution of statues that could be also stylistically linked with Asian statues allowing for a reliable dating. Stelae of types I and VI show similarities with sculptures of the Kimaks. The author, analysing the previously developed map, dated them to the 10th – 11th centuries and attributed them to an early stage of settlement in territories of the Seversky Donets River and the Priazov by the Polovtsians (Pletneva, 1974a, 61). Type III, in addition to feminine figures, presented well-armed men. Statues of type II date back to the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century. They occur in the whole territory of the steppe occupied by the Polovtsians. Pletneva believed that among these stelae there are many presentations without facial features and considered this to be an impact of Islam (Pletneva, 1974a, 63). Type II was present in the area of the lower basin of the Seversky Donets River and the Priazov, and spread to the upper basin of the Seversky Donets River, to the Caucasus and from the west reached the Dnieper River. According to the researcher it was younger than type I but appeared shortly before type III. Type IV stelae occur together with stelae of type II in the same territory and in a similar period. Stelae of type V were generated at the same time as stelae of type III and were erected in the whole range of the steppe. They presented well dressed women and men without weapons, dressed in long, parade caftans. Stela-shaped statues of type VI occurred mainly on the steppes of the Volga River Basin. Pletneva, following Fedorov-Davidov, dated them to the 13th century. They were the final link in the evolution of the anthropomorphic sculpture in the Middle Ages in this area (Pletneva, 1974a, 65).

Types of presentation of masculine and feminine faces and a layout of fingers on a vessel were analysed individually. Furthermore, Pletneva created a typology of details depicted on masculine and feminine statues: elements of attire, ornaments, weapon, utility and magic items and vessels. Then she compiled selected categories of objects into tables and transferred them onto maps. She obtained schemes of the most frequently presented types of helmets,

breastplates, masculine coiffures, trimmings on sleeves of masculine and feminine caftans, variants of feminine hats, scarves, "horns", earrings, necklaces and bar-shaped pendants (hryvnia) in territories of particular Polovtsian groups (Pletneva, 1974a, 25-52). The analysis confirmed the cultural proximity of groups belonging to the Dnieper association and Donets and Lukomorye associations. Families forming the North Azov federation (Поморское объединение) maintained contact with the Lower Donets and Don River associations. The Crimean Polovtsians were culturally closer to their Lukomorye neighbours, and the Ciscaucasus hordes were culturally closer to the Dnieper and Donetsk groups. This picture shows, on the one hand, a well-structured image of the material culture of the Polovtsians brought from Asia to Europe. On the other hand, the process indicates the development of local variants of the culture, forming autonomy in the material sphere when they reached stabilisation within their territories, subordinated to particular families. The comparative analysis of details helped capture the socio-political relations emerging between groups of families, in the absence of written testimonies concerning this issue. Additionally, the influence of neighbours on the modification of the material culture of the Polovtsians, the penetration of new technological innovations (helmets of the Russian type, chain armour) and new fashions (ornamental motifs, ornaments, vessels, etc.) became apparent (Pletneva, 1974a, 52).

The classification of details proved itself in the analysis of the material collected by S. A. Pletneva. Due to the expansion of the division it is possible to apply it in works dedicated to very abundant collections, subjected to statistical analysis, however, only when individual details not included by the researcher were not taken into account. For single exemplars or less abundant collections Pletneva's system is problematic due to inaccuracies. Despite collecting a large number of relics, the author did not take into account the opulence and diversity of items sculptured on statues. She did not know stelae discovered and published many years after she created her classification, and whose presentation of details consequently remains outside the system due to the individual method of presentation. So, while the basic typology is still valid, the system of division of details presented on statues does not always work. When studying smaller collections and single items it is more useful, though less convenient, to apply the descriptive approach to items sculptured on the statues.

L. S. Geraskova developed a typology for stelae from Asian and European areas. She divided 735 stelae into six types: standing (feminine and masculine exemplars, mainly from European areas), sitting (feminine and masculine, mainly European), presenting an upper part of a body, statues with hands (symmetrical and asymmetrical), statues without hands (symmetrical and asymmetrical), stelae with or without a pedestal. Then, each of the types was analysed in terms of relations with other units, therefore five indications differentiating statues were obtained. The following relationships were obtained: full presentation

– upper part of stelae (partial image), with a pedestal – without a pedestal, with presented arms – without arms, location of hands: symmetrical (a vessel in both hands) – asymmetrical (a vessel in a slightly raised right hand, left hand lowered), standing – sitting. This resulted in developing 28 classes of statues, considered further territorially, that is separately for Asia and Europe (Geraskova, 1991, 45). For 14 classes there are no statues matching. According to the author, they indicate some possible tendencies of the evolution of presentation of statues, waiting for being discovered. "Empty" classes allow also for including new types of stelae, even if applicable only for single exemplars (Geraskova, 1991, 53). Next, each group was subjected to statistical analysis. The aim was to capture trends in the evolution of Asian and European stelae and, as a consequence, understanding the processes of the final forming of the canon late European nomadic stelae. The authors concluded that both Asian and European "sitting" and "standing" stelae are developmentally linked (Geraskova, 1991, 52). Certain types of statues, according to Geraskova's divisions, occur in Asian and European areas at the same time.

Classes were additionally divided into "ranges". Asian ranges include ranges marked with letters A and D. The A range includes schematic Asian stelae. The author attributed them to early Turks, and dated them to the 6th – 9th centuries. At the same time she believed that separate subtypes of this range could have been manufactured by the Pechenegs in the 9th – 10th centuries (Geraskova, 1991, 78). The D range includes sculptures depicting a complete silhouette. According to Geraskova they are the earliest anthropomorphic statues. The B range includes all European stelae presenting the complete human figure. Analysing the details presented on these statues and dating them based on materials from burial inventories, the author concluded that their manufacturers were the Polovtsians. The B range is dated back to the 11th – 13th centuries (Geraskova, 1991, 82). Finally, the C range includes European statues with a schematic outline. According to the author, these statues were created by Torks tribes, which were quickly absorbed by the Polovtsians. She dated them back to the pre-Polovtsian period and believed that they functioned well into the 11th – 13th centuries, mainly in the area of Volga River Basin and the Ciscaucasus (Geraskova, 1991, 92, 97). In a summary, the author stated that all mediaeval types of European steppe stelae originated from Asian images. The type of "sitting" stelae from European areas was not, according to her, later than the "standing" one, but appeared at the same time and was created as a result of cultural impact from Byzantine and Ruthenian groups. The author believed that the mastery of the stone processing, concentration of specialised workshops around outcrops of appropriate kinds of rock, and use of sculpture tools unknown in Asian areas are all proof of the Byzantine and Rus impact on the stone craft of the Polovtsians. According to her, the Polovtsians' stelae had no direct, genetic links with early Turkic stelae or statues of "post-early Turkic"

nations and were a phenomena created in Europe (Geraskova, 1991, 100-101). Despite the fact that the Polovtsians were a federation of different Turkic nations, the canon of anthropomorphic images evolved in this environment was similar both to the early Turkic stelae and Turkic-speaking people of a later period. The researcher concluded that the resemblance of the Polovtsian stelae to the early Turkic stelae was represented in the presentation of attire, weapons and utility objects on statues. The impact of the "post-early Turkic" circle on the Polovtsian stelae includes: symmetrically laid hands with a vessel, removal of clothes from silhouettes and feminine figures.

K. I. Krasilnikov, inspired by the insights of Pletneva, developed his own typological system, generally only slightly different than the system created by her. Based on the analysis of 96 objects he divided the Polovtsian stelae into six types (Krasilnikov, 1999, 22-23). The division of the outline of the upper part of a silhouette he adopted after Pletneva (types I and II). He attributed to type I flat stelae-shaped statues, on which hands with a vessel were depicted in a shallow relief and attention was paid to details on the head. Pole-shaped stelae, presenting a standing figure with a vessel in the hands, had carefully developed heads and details of attire; they belonged to type II. The author believed that they showed similarities to the Kimak and Kipczak statues dated back to the 10th – 11th centuries. After Pletneva, he considered that stelae were characteristic of the Priazov area and the basin of the middle Seversky Donets River, and their appearance was related to the early phase of migrations undertaken by groups of Polovtsians from the Transvolga region to new pastures. Type I stelae he dated back to the 11th century, and type II to beginning of the 12th century up to the middle of the 12th century (Krasilnikov, 1999, 25). The type III was characterised by a spatial presentation of men and women in a standing position with a rich inventory of items and individualised physical features, including facial details. Type IV includes spatial statues of men and women sculptured as semi-sitting. The author even indicated an angle of bending thighs in relation to the torso: 130-150 degrees. These objects were characterised not only by the abundance of details and presentation of individual features, but also by extremely thorough sculpture work finished with a grinding on the whole surface. Type V depicted figures of men and women sitting on pedestals. The angle of bending limbs in relation to the torso is 90 – 100 degrees. Stelae were characterised by the abundance of details of attire, ornaments and weapons.

The researcher believed that most feminine presentations wore veils on their faces. He explained it with the activity of Islam in that area, allegedly present in the middle of the 12th century. The conclusion was based on the lack of facial details. This incorrect observation proves that the inquiry he carried out was superficial, or that he did not carry out it at all. Perhaps the author viewed items from a distance or only in photographs. The closer macroscopic observation of each stelae on which facial details are not visible, reveals traces of intentional,

mechanical damage or visible signs of natural erosion. The claim about the Islamic impacts seems to be illogical, because the "no-face" feature is also present on stelae of warriors, who were not obliged to cover their faces. Furthermore, as artists-sculptors carefully presented each detail on a sculpture, veils on faces of the Polovtsian women would also have been modelled and would have covered the neck and ears. The lack of faces is an effect of natural processes of the stone erosion or a historic or contemporary vandalism. Stelae of type V belong to the monumental category: a height of 2.50 – 3.50 m. These stelae and pedestals are characterised by a careful sculpturing. Silhouettes at the final stage of processing were additionally smoothed. Statues of types III, IV and V were dated by the author back to the second half of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century (Krasilnikov, 1999, 25). Type VI includes pole-shaped statues without limbs. Details of faces, heads, neck ornaments and belts were carefully depicted. A vessel was indicated schematically. Based on Pletneva's conclusions, the author dated them back to 1240-1250 and, in agreement with her, he believed that their specific canon of presentation was related to the dramatic heroisation of warriors, highlighting their immortality in the light of fights with Mongols-Tatars. The innovation of Geraskove's classification was distinguishing the semi-sitting type. In a summary Krasilnikov noticed that his typology should be treated provisionally, because there are many statues with intermediate features, particularly in relation to the analysis of stelae of I and II types as well as of II and IV types (Krasilnikov, 1999, 24). Again after Pletneva, he repeated that stelae were related to cult-sacrifice constructions and the cult of ancestors, and that they depicted actual warriors and their wives who, after death, became the guardians of a family (Krasilnikov, 1999, 26). Following Pletneva, he stated that the statues could have been painted (Krasilnikov, 1999, 35).

J. Daszkiewicz and E. Tryjarski focused in their work on developing a classification of anthropomorphic sculptures present in an area of broadly understood steppe and forest steppe within Eastern Europe. They took into account the territorial and chronological scope as well as typological features. According to the researchers, group I includes Neolithic stelae of "various types" genetically associated with "Scythian stelae". Group II includes "Scythian stelae". The authors broadly commented on both the cultural affiliation of creators of Scythian stelae and their dating. They believed that stelae are linked with the Balts, Slavic and early Turkic cultures. This misinterpretation resulted from a lack of knowledge of the literature concerning archaeological research in Central and Western Asia as well as works of numerous scientists working on Kimmerian stelae (mentioned by neither researcher) and Scythian stelae, which were published in 1980 (*inter alia*: V.P. Bielozor, V.V. Volkov, M.V. Gorelik, G.L. Evdokimov, L.P. Krylova, V.D. Kubarev, D.G. Savinov, N.L. Chlienova, P.N. Schultz). The relationship of Kimmerian and Scythian stelae and their analogues with Asian sculpture was comprehensively studied by V. S. Olkhovskiy. According to the

classification of Daszkiewicz and Tryjarski, group III includes "antique sculptures" from the "Northern Black Sea colonies". Group IV includes Slavic stelae of two subtypes (pole-shaped and spatial). Group V consists of Caucasus sculptures, however the authors were unable to determine what they meant by this concept. They clearly indicated that they did not mean Turkic or "the so called Scythian" statues. Group VI includes Turkic "typologically various" statues (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 104). The authors believed that Turkic stelae could be divided into three types: pole-shaped with sculptured head, stelae with a head and marked hands but without a vessel, and "classic" stelae holding a vessel in hands. They believed that it is somehow a primitive form of presentation of the theme, however sufficient for research purposes. They considered Pletneva's typology to be too extended and therefore "useless". In their opinion the development of the classification system based on statues originating from museum collections was a mistake, because the material had been selected long before it was passed into the institution (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 98 – 105). Many of Daszkiewicz and Tryjarski's unreasonable objections to Pletneva's conclusions arose from their rejection of research methods applied by archaeologists and their critique of the method of analysis of materials which, according to the authors, was subjective and selective (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 85). They, themselves, relied primarily on historical sources that often contained brief information about anthropomorphic stelae. The information was frequently so poorly defined that it could not be subjected to any scientific criterion; an issue often raised by the authors themselves (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 77). Therefore they denied their own method of research.

In summary, it should be noted that the best developed and most reasonable classification system of the anthropomorphic stelae of mediaeval nomads from Eastern Europe is the typology developed by Pletneva. It is also the best analytical tool, despite the objections specified above. It is suitable for studies on larger numbers of stelae or museum collections. Due to the unstable situation of a number of museum collections, of which single exemplars have been analysed in published studies, the method can be applied to secondary studies of collections of statues. This is important, because many of them require typological verification and description of technical conditions documenting the progress of the stones' degradation. During the past 40 years, in all collections the quantity of exhibited stelae has changed: some have increased due to the addition of new findings from administrative units (Raion, District) subordinated to a particular institution, while others have decreased as a result of losses, destruction or other causes (as for example in a case of the Veliko-Anadol Forest Museum). In principle, there are no catalogue publications of stelae collections from the area of Eastern Europe. Those that were published in the second half of the previous century need to be updated. The classification system of Pletneva also aids the reconstruction process of recovering statues' lost details due

to the possibility of finding the closest analogies for the object being saved. In the case of single, newly discovered exemplars intended for museum exhibitions or storage in a museum lapidarium Pletneva's method is an auxiliary tool in the quick determination of the type and chronology of a relic. However, we do advise in such cases the use of the full description of an object, particularly including the technical conditions of stelae and the preparation of photographic documentation and careful drawings of the finding *in situ*. Preparation of such extensive material requires care, time and attention. It is, however, an inestimable source of information for professionals dealing with issues related to anthropomorphic stelae (archaeologists, art historians, ethnographers, geologists, religion experts, historians and finally conservators) whose work is eased by well-prepared documentation.